Ham-Policy Digest   Thu, 11 Mar 93   Volume 93 : Issue   62

Today's Topics:
                        Ban on 800 mhz receivers
                            public apology
                    Reduction of the code requirements

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 10 Mar 93 12:50:45 EDT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!rpi!news.crd.ge.com!
sunblossom!ge-dab!cho006.cho.ge.com!wright_t@ames.arpa
Subject: Ban on 800 mhz receivers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I've been hearing a lot of scuttle-butt about banning the sale
of radios which will receive 800 mhz frequencies such as those used by
cellular phones. Is there a bill in congress now ? Does anybody have
reliable information concerning this topic that they can email to me ?
Such a ban is clearly nonsense. I would like to hear from any organization
that is ready to fight this issue.

Tim Wright
wright_t@cho.ge.com

*** I do not represent GE Fanuc on any issue. This is a private concern. ***

Date: 10 Mar 93 02:05:23 GMT
From: gossip.pyramid.com!pyramid!infmx!seashore!randall@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: public apology
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

tatsuya@sofya.math.byu.edu writes:
>Okay ...Who: to local Ham related comapany
>   what, why: they claim that they replace the part, but it just like what
>I had on before..... even have a same scratch ....
>where: on the air....using radio....

I can relate.   The local Ham Radio Outlet was not happy about
something I posted on Usenet.

I don't see any problem with discussing the incident on the air.
You have sufficient evidence that a part was "replaced" with the
same part.   Morally speaking, I don't see that you did anything
wrong judging by the information you have given.

In any case, you can legally say whatever you want on the
air. (within the limits set by the FCC, e.g. no profanity, etc.)
If the "local ham company" wishes to defend itself, it can
do so on the air as well.

73 DE KK6MY

--

=-=
Randall Rhea   Informix Software, Inc.
Project Manager, MIS Sales/Marketing Systems   uunet!pyramid!infmx!randall

----

Date: 11 Mar 93 01:57:12 GMT
From: opel!slc1!vk2bea!michael@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Reduction of the code requirements
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <9303090020.AA15680@netmail.microsoft.com> a-kevinp@microsoft.COM
(Kevin Purcell, Rho) writes:
>
>In 1959 at the Geneva WARC the code requirement as waived above 144Mhz,
>and lead to the creation of the first nocode licences in the UK in 1964
>(was the UK the first to have a codeless licence?).
>

No Australia had it's 'Z' calls in the 50's. These limited licencees
could transmit on 6 metres and above. (seems like it is inconsitant
with the following statement)

>In 1979 the lowest frequency for which a code test was required was
>dropped to 30MHz at the (second) Geneva WARC.
>

(perhaps there was a footnote for Region 3 (or Australia))

--
Michael Katzmann   >   Broadcast Sports Technology Inc.
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~   <   Crofton, Maryland. U.S.A
Amateur Radio Stations: >
NV3Z / VK2BEA / G4NYV / AAR3VK   <   opel!vk2bea!michael@uunet.uu.net

----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #62
****